DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 920 IR 054 506

AUTHOR Potter, Linda L.
TITLE A Study of the Hugh A. Glauser School of Music Library.
PUB DATE Dec 92
NOTE 61p.; Master's Research Paper, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; College Libraries; College Students; Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; Library Collections; Library Facilities; *Library Materials; Library Technical Processes; *Music; Musicians; *Nonprint Media; Student Attitudes; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; User Needs (Information; Users (Information); User Satisfaction (Information); Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS *Kent State University OH; *Music Libraries; Student Surveys; Teacher Surveys

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted of the facilities, collection, and services of the Hugh A. Glauser School of Music Library at Kent State University (Ohio). A survey of 130 students (response rate of about 32.5 percent) identified users of the library, how they use it, and the extent to which the library meets users' needs. Overall, 73 percent of the respondents were satisfied with the Glauser Library, although many suggestions were made for improvement in terms of the building and facilities, equipment, collection, and staff. A survey of 19 faculty members (response rate of 21.1 percent) indicated that 68 percent are satisfied with the system for handling reserve books, but all felt that there was room for improvement and suggestions were made accordingly. The collection of the library was evaluated using two books that give lists of recommended works for the music library. The collection of the Glauser Library contains 74 percent of the materials recommended by these authorities. Nine tables present study findings. Two appendixes contain the student and faculty surveys. (Contains 14 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED354920

A STUDY OF THE HUGH A. GLAUSER SCHOOL OF MUSIC LIBRARY

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library and Information Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Library Science

by

Linda L. Potter

December, 1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Linda L. Potter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

IR054536

ABSTRACT

This research paper is an in-depth study of the facilities, collection, and services of the Hugh A. Glasser School of Music Library at Kent State University (Kent, Ohio).

The first part of this study involves the use of a survey to determine who the users of the music department library are, how they use the library, and to what extent the music library meets their needs. Since there had never been an evaluation of this kind at the library, the survey was the fastest way to gain information concerning the views of the musicians at Kent State University. Overall, 73% of the students were satisfied with the Glauser Library, although there were many suggestions made for improvement. Of the faculty that participated, 68% were satisfied with the system for handling reserve books but all felt there was room for improvement and suggestions were made here also.

There is also an in-depth look at the collection in the music library using two books that give lists of recommended books, scores, journals, recordings, and cassettes for an academic library. These two books are: A Basic Classical and Operatic Recordings Collection for Libraries by Kenyon C. Rosenberg and A Basic Music Library: Essential Scores and Books by Pauline Bayne. The overall collection of the Hugh A. Glauser Library is 74% of the materials recommended in those books.

Master's Research Paper by

Linda L. Potter

A.A., Concordia College (Ann Arbor, MI), 1969

B.A., Concordia University (River Forest, IL), 1972

M.S., Indiana University, 1979

M.L.S., Kent State University, 1992

Approved by

Advisor_____ Date_____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Dr. Lois Buttlar (Library Science) and Mr. Jack Scott (Music Librarian) for their help and encouragement during the writing of this paper. Their help is greatly appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....iii

LIST OF TABLES.....v

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

Background.....1

Purpose of the study.....3

Objectives.....3

Definition of Terms.....3

Limitations.....4

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....5

III. METHODOLOGY.....11

IV. FINDINGS.....13

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....42

Recommendations for Further Study.....43

Appendix A- Student Questionnaire.....44

B- Faculty Questionnaire.....50

References Cited.....53

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. Reasons Students Use the Music Library.....15

2. Rankings of Facilities.....18

3. Rankings of Library Environment.....19

4. Rankings of Services and Staff.....20

5. Rankings for Collection Development.....22

6. Distribution of Overall Feelings.....25

7. Distribution of Recommendations.....28

8. Collection Use by Categories.....30

9. Analysis of the Music Library.....34

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A music library is a special library. It consists of materials and services needed by a particular set of users. Within the academic setting, it can be a branch of a larger university library and is usually located within the music department.

One of the main reasons for the growth of the library in general came about because of the GI Bill. Many veterans of World War II began or returned to complete the education the war interrupted. Many new degrees were established, including degrees in music. During the forties, 51 music library collections were started. During the fifties, 61 music libraries were started and during the sixties, 63 music collections were started (Watanabe 1981).

Many changes were occurring in the collection of libraries. New journals were being written and some of those halted because of the war started again. Books and scores also became more available.

Advances in technology brought about a great deal of change in the library. Sound recordings were of better quality than before. As a result, many libraries began to provide audio services for their patrons (Mortland 1984).

During the seventies, things began to slow down because the economy was lower. Libraries began to re-examine their policies and goals. Collections didn't grow as fast because the money was unavailable. Staff positions and raises were frozen.

The growth of automation in the eighties brought the greatest change for the library. The idea now was to put current resources to work at their fullest capacity (Watanabe 1981).

The services available in the music library are comparable to those of the main library. These may include reference books, reserve books, circulation and study areas. There will probably also be audio services since recordings may or may not circulate outside the library.

According to Mortland (1984, 88) "music libraries in the future will continue to grow and expand their services, and because of this there will be an even greater need for specialists in music". As a result music librarianship as a profession will grow. No longer will the librarian be just someone who knows a great deal about music. The librarian will also have to have management and business skills to keep a facility operating at its best.

A music library exists to serve the clientele who enter the facility, especially the faculty and students of the school of music. How good that library is doesn't depend only on the size of the collection, but also upon the

quality of the services offered to the patron. The Hugh A. Glauser School of Music Library provides collections and services for approximately 90 faculty and 850 students in the school of music; as well as to other students on the KSU campus and to other patrons who use the facilities.

Purpose of the Study

This research paper is an in-depth study of the facilities, collection and services of the Hugh A. Glauser School of Music Library at Kent State University.

Objectives

The objectives of the study are to provide data that answer the following questions:

1. Who are the users of the music library?
2. How do they use the library?
3. To what extent does the library meet their needs?
4. To what extent does the music library collection match recommended guidelines for academic libraries?

Definition of Terms

Access- the ability to obtain material.

Availability- is the material wanted in the library and ready for use.

Faculty- any person that teaches a course at the university. This includes graduate teaching fellows.

Patrons- anyone who uses the library for any reason at all.

Services- the different kinds of help given to the patron while in the library. This will include reference assistance, CATALYST assistance,, etc.

Staff- the people who work in the music library.

Limitations

This study is limited to the Hugh A. Glauser Music Library at Kent State University and, therefore, the findings are not necessarily generalizable to all academic music department libraries.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In 1961, a faculty survey was done at the University of Michigan (University of Michigan 1961). Almost all phases of the library were favorably evaluated; although the social science and humanities areas had more criticism.

One question asked the faculty to rate the quality of the book collection by area of specialization. Nineteen percent of the School of Music faculty rated the library collection as excellent, 59 percent rated the library as good, and 22 percent rated it as fair or poor (University of Michigan 1961, 17). Forty-six percent of that faculty said that they had to restrict class assignments while 54 percent said they did not restrict assignments (University of Michigan 1961, 21). Another question was concerned with staff services. Twenty-one percent of the music faculty rated the library staff as excellent, 42 percent rated them as good, 32 percent rated then as adequate, and only 5 percent rated them as poor (University of Michigan 1961, 35). Overall, no one in the School of Music rated the library as excellent, 35 percent rated it as good, 43 percent rated the library as adequate, and 22 percent rated

it as somewhat or greatly annoying (University of Michigan 1961, 34).

The students of Murray State University participated in a survey in 1968 (Kuhlman 1968). Some of the results follow: Fifty-six percent of the students said they were able to obtain the material they needed in the library while 43 percent were unable to receive wanted material (Kuhlman 1968, 172). Forty-two percent of the students indicated that the book selection was adequate, while 57.7 percent felt the collection was not adequate (Kuhlman 1968, 172). Almost 78 percent felt that library personnel were able to give the service and information needed; 22 percent felt the opposite (Kuhlman 1968, 172). Library hours were also included in the survey. Seventy-five percent liked the weekday hours, 55.5 percent liked the Saturday hours, and only 34 percent liked the Sunday hours (Kuhlman 1968, 174). Valparaiso University did a self-study in 1980 (Valparaiso University 1980). The questionnaire asked questions concerning course-related books, periodicals, and reference material; photo-copiers; books for personal use; and reserve services. The library staff concluded that:

> Our library holdings are about adequate for our undergraduate program, but are minimal, at least, for our graduate program. Increased cost of books, scores, and recordings is creating problems in maintaining the current level of effectiveness. Listening equipment, some of which is thirty years old, must be replaced very soon. It is strongly recommended that one of the staff positions at the library be filled by a trained music librarian (Valparaiso 1980, 200).

In 1985, Celia Prescott published information about a survey of music libraries in the United Kingdom (Basart 1985). The survey would be good for a comparison of holdings, services, staffing, and budgets for individual libraries. One section includes information about circulation, reference holdings, periodicals, and charges. Says Basart (Basart 1985, 306) "No comparable statistical study exists for music libraries in the United States. Whether it would be feasible to do is perhaps questionable, but at least it is worth keeping in mind".

In 1986, a survey was conducted at Cleveland State University as a pre-automation project (Lupone 1986). Faculty, staff, students, and non-university users participated. The purpose was to make sure that user needs would be known while planning for automation. The survey revealed that during the 1984-85 fiscal year the library received 180 records, 92 cassettes, and 30 videocassettes (Lupone 1986, 23). Nine hundred nineteen titles of added music and 1,117 total volumes of added music were recorded (Lupone 1986, 51). It was also discovered that the card catalog in the Audio/Music Service was incomplete. Scores and recordings were listed in the catalog but there was only one card per album. This created problems if there was more than one selection on the record. Books were not listed in the catalog at all; nor was there subject access. These were things that the staff hoped to correct with the new

automation system. Since the card catalog in the main library was current and up-to-date, patrons were advised to consult that for information.

Another 1986 survey, involving 96 academic libraries, asked questions concerning administrative structure, physical facilities, and the degree of satisfaction concerning the centralization or decentralization of cataloging. Eighty-nine percent of the music libraries were controlled by the central library administration, 4 percent were controlled by the music school, and 3 percent had some control by both. Twenty-three percent of those controlled by the main library said that they did have quite a bit of autonomy (Thompson 1986, 80). Fifty-one percent of the music library collections were located in the music school, 33 percent were located in the main library collection, and 4 percent had a split collection. Eleven percent were located in neither the main library or the music building (Thompson 1986, 80). Twelve percent of the libraries did their cataloging in the music library and 39 percent did it in the main building. Forty-seven percent did cataloging work in both places while 1 percent did some in another place. According to Thompson:

> Many of the interviewed music librarians perceived that centralized administrative practices affect users adversely in terms of 1) the quality of cataloging, 2) the speed of book processing, and 3) the loss of a valuable resource- a music specialist- at the user contact point (Thompsom 1986, 80).

A common complaint was the lack of understanding by the administration about the problem concerning the best usage of the music specialist. Sixteen libraries involved in the survey switched from decentralized cataloging to centralized cataloging. Seven of these libraries were satisfied with the change while nine libraries were unsatisfied. Twelve libraries changed from centralized cataloging to decentralized cataloging. Eleven libraries were satisfied and none were unsatisfied (Thompson 1986, 82). "Survey results and comments indicate a definite preference by music librarians to having the music cataloger physically located in the music library" (Thompson 1986, 83).

In 1986, the library of Kent State University, supported by the Applied Psychology Center, did a survey of the university faculty (Schloman 1986). Although the return rate was only 37.2 percent, it was found to be "representative of the total university faculty" (Schloman 1986, 498). Faculty were, overall, satisfied with the library. The book collection in the typical faculty member's area was rated as adequate while the periodical collection was found to be less than adequate. It was not possible to check response rate by department because of the low return of questionnaires.

A survey to gather opinions on the overall quality of the library at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville was done in 1987 (Lyons 1987). The survey also checked into the

collection, facilities, and services at the library. There was a response rate of over 75 percent (Lyons 1987, 5). The results of the survey were used for library planning and development. The system rated each question on a four point scale: poor, fair, good, and excellent. The results were summarized in 96 tables, and were divided into graduate, undergraduate, and research categories. Some of the results follow:

> The overall quality of the library system was: poor- 6 percent, fair- 35 percent, good- 54 percent, and excellent 5- percent. The overall quality of the collection was: poor- 18 percent, fair- 41 percent, good- 3 percent, and excellent- 4 percent. The quality of study space was: poor- 14 percent, fair- 57 percent, good- 29 percent. The overall evaluation of the library was: poor- 4 percent, fair- 18 percent, good- 71 percent, and excellent- 7 percent. (Lyons 1987)

In 1988, Pamela Noyes Engelbrecht published a book about surveys (Engelbrecht 1988). The flyer and kit were designed to help large academic libraries plan surveys for various library concerns. (No results were printed in the book.) Information was included about 18 surveys given by some members of the Association of Research Libraries. They are divided into four categories: general user surveys, user surveys for long-range planning, brief surveys for specific services, and use surveys.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This paper is an in-depth study of the collection, facilities and services of the Hugh A. Glauser School of Music Library at Kent State University. The methodology is two-fold. The first part is the use of a questionnaire given to faculty and students in the music building.

The questionnaire was distruibted through the music classes. Going directly to the classes ensures that both students who use the music library and students who do not use the library are contacted. There was boxes in central locations, including the music library, the rehearsal room and the music office, so that both faculty and students could deposit the completed questionaires in them. The questions are divided into six sections: demographic information, building and facilities. services and staff, collection, overall attitudes, and recommendations. There is also a small one-page questionnaire directed to the faculty. Copies of both questionnaires are included in Appendix A and Appendix B.

The second part of this research paper is a close look at the collection in the music library. On the recommendation of Mr. Jack Scott, Music Librarian, three

different sources were used to evaluate the various aspects of the collection. These evaluation lists include:

William E. Grim's biographical essay on the "Music of the Classic Era; a Guide to the Basic Literature" (Grim 1986). Mr. Grim mentions general works, period studies and individual composers. Kenyon C. Rosenberg's book A Basic Classical and Operatic Recordings Collection for Libraries. Mr. Rosenberg's intention was to list "not only the usual representative group of well-known works by easily recognized composers, but also those works of quality by lesser known composers" (Rosenberg 1987, iii). The final source is Pauline Bayne's book A Basic Music Library: Essential Scores and Books (Bayne 1983). This book contains a list of essential books and scores for an academic music library.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

A total of 400 questionnaires were handed out to students enrolled in music classes, music education classes, liberal education classes (for a required course in music literature), and ensemble classes with 130 returned in time to be included in these results. This is a return rate of 32.5%. Three reasons can help account for the low response rate. The first is that the survey was handed out during the beginning of the semester and many freshman had not had a chance to use the library yet. The second reason for this low rate is because of the length of the questionnaire. The third reason is that it was impossible to account for the number of students that were registered for two or more music classes. (All students majoring in music have to participate in at least one of the campus ensembles.) Since the students were asked to fill out the survey only one time, any multiple copies were returned. There were several instances where parts of the questionnaire were left unanswered. That was expected because the students were asked to answer only those parts that were pertinent to

them. Following is a question by question description of the results.

The first question dealt with the status of the respondent. Two faculty members filled out the survey for a response rate of 1.6%. (Faculty responses were not expected because they were given a small one page survey of their own.) Thirty undergraduate students filled out the survey for a response rate of 23.3% and 97 graduate students for a response rate of 75.2%.

The second question dealt with how often the library is used. Twenty-five respondents (19.4%) said they use the library zero hours per week (meaning that they use the library on occasion). Seventy-six (58.0%) use the library one to five hours per week which was the highest percentage. Twenty-one ((16.3%) use the library six to ten hours per week. Six (4.7%) use the library more than ten hours per week.

Students were then asked why they use the music library. The largest categories of respondents (82 or 63.1%) said that they use the library to find specific information, followed by 76 (58.5%) who use it to check out materials, 64 (49.2%) who consult reference materials and 62 (47.7%) who use the main library's online catalog, CATALYST (see Table 1).

Table 1.

Reasons Students Use the Music Library

Reasons	f	%
To review new journals	30	23.1
To find specific information	82	63.1
To check out materials	76	58.5
To use reference materials	64	49.2
To use AV materials	38	29.2
To use the computer lab	11	8.5
To look at new books	17	13.1
To consult the librarian	13	10.0
To use CATALYST	62	47.7
To use own books and materials	35	26.9
To use reserve materials	56	43.1
To use photocopy machine	5	3.9
To listen to music required for class	3	2.3

Single responses were written in for the following: to copy notes, to listen to tapes of concerts, to dub audio for use in class, to do research, to use the study center, to do personal research, to study in quiet, to listen to music and to go to work.

Question number four dealt with the type of work space. A work table is preferred by 51 (41.1%) of the students; an individual carrel by 30 (24.2%); a table for two to four by 17 (13.7%) and an enclosed individual carrel by 14 (11.3%). Seven (5.6%) preferred a study room and four (3.2%) a work table for four or more.

The next set of questions asked what students would do if the specific item they needed could not be found. Seventy-one (54.6%) said they would check the re-shelving area. Thirty-eight (29.2%) said they would talk to their professor. Ten (7.7%) said they would use the Internet system to find another location that owned the item. Twenty-nine (22.3%) said they would go to another library. Fifty-three (40.8%) said they would see if the item was checked out and put a hold on it. Fifty (38.5%) said they would browse in the stacks for something else. Thirty-six (27.7%) would use what was available and hope that it was alright. Ninety (69.2%) would ask the library staff to look. Eleven (8.46%) would use OCLC. Eleven (8.46%) would apply for ILL. Forty-seven (36.2%) would give up and leave.

A majority of the rest of the survey asked for ratings of various things in the library. The scale used numbers from five to one, with five being excellent and one being poor. DK was used for don't know. (If a student had not used a section of the library, she/he was instructed to mark DK.) The location of the library was ranked most highly of all the variables related to facilities (see Table 2). The library environment received

relatively high marks for lighting, quietness, security and cleanliness. Heating and temperature are noted as problems (see Table 3).

TABLE 2

Distribution of Rankings of Facilities
in Frequencies and Percentages

	5	4	3	2	1	DK
Study Space	3 2.4%	30 24.4%	42 34.1%	26 21.1%	9 7.3%	13 10.6%
Seating	2 1.6%	28 22.8%	42 34.1%	23 18.7%	13 10.6%	15 12.2%
Photocopying	6 4.9%	26 21.1%	34 27.6%	25 20.3%	19 15.4%	13 10.6%
Carrels	5 4.1%	17 14.0%	39 32.2%	24 19.8%	6 5.0%	30 24.8%
Recording Devices	9 7.3%	30 24.4%	31 25.2%	14 11.4%	14 11.4%	25 20.3%
Location	27 22.0%	30 24.4%	38 30.9%	12 9.8%	7 5.7%	9 7.3%
Computer Lab	3 2.5%	8 6.6%	17 13.9%	18 14.8%	20 16.4%	56 45.9%
Typing Facilities	1 0.8%	4 3.3%	9 7.5%	14 11.7%	39 32.5%	53 44.2%
CATALYST	9 7.4%	31 25.4%	27 22.1%	20 16.4%	2 1.6%	33 27.0%
Video Player	8 6.6%	15 12.4%	21 17.4%	17 14.0%	10 8.3%	50 41.3%
Cassette Player	12 9.8%	37 30.3%	29 23.8%	11 9.0%	5 4.1%	28 23.0
Record Player	13 10.7%	31 25.4%	22 18.0%	19 15.6%	3 2.5%	34 27.9%

TABLE 3

Distribution of Rankings of Library Environment in Frequencies and Percentages

	5	4	3	2	1	DK
Lighting	12 9.8%	51 41.5%	45 36.6%	5 4.1%	4 3.3%	6 4.9%
Heating	5 4.1%	19 15.4%	33 26.8%	24 19.5%	25 20.3%	17 13.8%
Ventilation	6 4.9%	28 22.8%	43 35.0%	25 20.3%	12 9.8%	9 7.3%
Temperature	2 1.6	22 17.9%	34 27.6%	26 21.1%	25 20.3%	14 11.4%
Signs	11 8.9%	27 22.0%	46 37.4%	15 12.2%	6 4.9%	18 14.6%
Quietness	18 14.6%	36 29.3%	36 29.3%	14 11.4%	14 11.4%	5 4.1%
Organization	10 8.1%	30 24.4%	35 28.5%	21 17.1%	17 13.8%	10 8.1%
Security	19 15.4%	32 26.0%	35 28.5%	5 4.1%	7 5.7%	25 20.3%
Maintenance	10 8.1%	31 25.2%	37 30.1%	21 17.1%	10 8.1%	14 11.4%
Comfort	8 6.5%	20 16.3%	53 43.1%	18 14.6%	15 12.2%	9 7.3%
Cleanliness	15 12.2	34 27.6%	41 33.3%	16 13.0%	9 7.3%	8 6.5%

Students feel CATALYST is easy to understand; they rank cassette players and CD players relatively high, and are least satisfied with the computer lab. All categories of library assistance received relatively high ratings (see Table 4).

TABLE 4

Distribution of Services and Staff
in Frequencies and Percentages

	5	4	3	2	1	DK
CATALYST						
Availability	15 12.3%	26 21.3%	31 25.4%	18 14.8%	7 5.7%	25 20.5%
Location	17 13.9%	35 28.7%	36 29.5%	8 6.6%	4 3.35	22 18.0%
Functioning	16 13.1%	32 26.2%	31 25.4%	11 9.0%	7 5.7%	25 20.5%
Understanding	22 18.0%	35 28.7%	25 20.5%	10 8.2%	6 4.9%	24 19.7%

Table 4 (Cont.)

	5	4	3	2	1	DK
EQUIPMENT						
Copy Machine	12 9.8%	26 21.1%	36 29.3%	25 20.3%	14 11.4%	10 8.1%
Record Players	11 8.9%	31 25.2%	35 28.5%	11 8.9%	1 0.8%	34 27.6%
Cassette Player	12 9.8%	39 31.7%	30 24.4%	12 9.8%	3 2.4%	27 22.0%
CD Player	15 12.3%	35 28.7%	18 14.8%	10 8.2%	3 2.5%	41 33.6%
Taping Machine	11 9.0%	14 11.5%	27 22.1%	15 12.3%	14 11.5%	41 33.6%
Dubbing Machine	12 9.8%	19 15.4%	16 13.0%	20 16.3%	18 14.6%	38 30.9%
Computer Lab	4 3.3%	8 6.6%	18 14.8%	11 9.0%	21 17.2%	60 49.25
QUALITY OF LIBRARY ASSISTANCE						
Locating of Material	22 17.7%	34 27.4%	29 23.4%	13 10.5%	11 8.9%	15 12.1%
Showing Equipment	26 21.0%	29 23.4%	24 19.4%	14 11.3%	9 7.3%	22 17.7%
Giving help	30 24.2%	33 26.6%	27 21.8%	13 10.5%	11 8.9%	10 8.1%
Cooperation	43 34.7%	27 21.8%	18 14.5%	14 11.3%	12 9.7%	10 8.1%

The reference collection and music history books were rated higher than other categories related to collection size. Periodicals and reference books were rated highest with respect to quality of the collection. Students feel that reference books are readily available to them (see Table 5).

TABLE 5

Distribution of Rankings for Collection Development by Frequencies and Percentages

	5	4	3	2	1	DK
SIZE OF THE COLLECTION						
Music Theory	3 2.5%	14 11.7%	31 25.8%	6 5.0%		66 55.0%
Reference Books	14 11.6%	33 27.3%	29 24.0%	4 3.3%	1 0.8%	40 33.1%
Music Manuscripts	5 4.1%	23 19.0%	26 21.5%	14 11.6%	4 3.3%	49 40.5%
Vocal Music	2 1.7%	14 11.7%	17 14.2%	10 8.3%	1 0.8%	76 63.3%
Instrumental Music	8 6.6%	19 15.7%	30 24.8%	20 16.5%	7 5.8%	37 30.6%
Music Literature	3 2.5%	23 19.2%	34 28.3%	11 9.2%	3 2.5%	46 38.2%
Music History	11 9.3%	32 27.1%	36 30.5%	11 9.3%	1 0.8%	27 22.9%
Conducting	1 0.8%	14 11.6%	16 13.2%	10 8.3%	4 3.3%	76 62.8%
Music Instruction	6 5.0%	20 16.5%	37 30.6%	10 8.3%	3 2.5%	45 37.2%

Table 5 (Cont.)

	5	4	3	2	1	DK
QUALITY OF THE COLLECTION						
Books	10 8.3%	36 29.8%	35 28.9%	13 10.7%	1 0.8%	26 21.5%
Periodicals	10 8.3%	41 33.9%	25 20.7%	6 5.0%	1 0.8%	38 31.4%
Reference Books	13 10.7%	38 31.4%	29 24.0%	11 9.1%	2 1.7%	28 23.1%
Reserve Books	12 9.9%	26 21.5%	36 29.8%	8 6.6%	1 0.8%	38 31.4%
Recorded Material	13 10.7%	30 24.8%	27 22.3%	17 14.0%	11 9.1%	23 19.0%
AVAILABILITY OF THE COLLECTION						
Books	15 12.4%	32 26.4%	31 25.6%	13 10.7%	3 2.5%	27 22.3%
Periodicals	15 12.4%	36 29.8%	25 20.7%	5 4.1%	2 1.7%	38 31.4%
Reference Books	17 14.2%	37 30.8%	22 18.3%	12 10.0%	3 2.5%	29 24.2%
Reserve Books	17 14.0%	28 23.1%	28 23.1%	3 2.5%	2 1.7%	43 35.5%
Recorded Material	17 14.3%	33 27.7%	25 21.0%	11 9.2%	7 5.9%	26 21.8%

The majority of the students (73%) rate the music library overall as average or better and 74% rate the quality of interaction between staff and students the same way. Overall feelings about the library are most negative related to library hours (57%). A majority have found that material needed is not on the shelf, that time to locate materials is excessive and that material is missing from the collection (see Table 6).

The largest frequency by far was the question dealing with the library hours. Sixty-two (57.4%) stated that the hours were the highest priority in the library. The copy machines were the next highest priority to the students with 47 (43.5%). Staff concerns were the next priority with 31 (28.4%). Manuscripts and scores were the next concern with 30 (27.8%). Book acquisitions came next with 28 (25.9%). Computer facilities followed, with 26 (23.9%). The availability of AV machines was the next concern, with 22 (202.%). The availability of CATALYST terminals was the next priority, with 21 (19.3%). Periodical acquisitions and AV acquisitions tied the next priority, with 19 (17.4%) each. The lowest priority, according to the students, is reference holdings, with 13 (11.9%).

Table 6

Distribution of Overall Feelings
By Rankings and Percentages

	5	4	3	2	1	DK
How do you rate the music library overall?						
	5	40	43	18	4	10
	4.2%	33.3%	35.8%	15.0%	3.3%	8.3%
How do rate the quality of interaction between staff and students?						
	26	35	28	12	11	8
	21.7%	29.2%	23.3%	10.0%	9.2%	6.7%
What are your feelings about the library hours?						
	6	16	15	32	36	15
	5.0%	13.3%	12.5%	26.7%	30.0%	12.5%

Has the following ever happened to you?	yes	no	DK
The material needed is not on the shelf.	75	42	1
	63.6%	35.6%	0.8%
Time to locate materials is excessive.	64	53	1
	54.2%	44.9%	0.8%
Material was missing from the collection.	69	48	1
	58.5%	40.7%	0.8%
Recd overdue notice for returned material.	42	75	1
	35.6%	63.6%	0.8%

The last question gave the students a chance to list what they would do to "change, add, or improve any aspect of the library." Some of those suggestions follow.

BUILDING AND FACILITIES- The idea that was mentioned the most is to improve and expand the hours that the library is open. One suggestion was to increase the budget for work study students so that the library could be open longer. The second idea is to give the library more space. Mention was made of the "claustrophobic" atmosphere of the library. Others mentioned expanding by taking out some walls. Another idea given by the students is to keep the library clean and warm. Mention was made concerning dust on the shelves and in the carpet. One student wondered why the cleaning crew did not clean in the music library.

EQUIPMENT- Numerous students mentioned making the library equipment more "up-to-date." The suggestions included the purchase of CD's, AV machines, newer headphones, computer software, and an OCLC connection. The three most mentioned are the ordering of more copy machines, dubbing machines, and CATALYST terminals.

COLLECTION- Mention was made to filling in the gaps in the periodical collection, the ordering of current books of better quality, ordering multiple copies of frequently used books, the purchase of choral scores and concerto scores, buying recordings of better quality, and the inclusion of jazz and contemporary recordings in the collection.

STAFF- Numerous students suggested giving the music librarian a decent budget so that he could hire and train competent staff members. Mention was made to slow check out time of both reserve and circulating material, not being able to get help when needed, the staff person not knowing how to help the patron, and hiring music students because they would understand requests better.

OVERALL SUGGESTIONS- Other things suggested include get books re-shelved faster, get patron access to records, make it easier for patrons to find things, provide more privacy to listen to recordings in quiet, post instructions concerning the use of various equipment, allow tapes and recordings to be checked out overnight, combine all the music books from the main library with those from the music library, and post signs in the Music/Speech building telling how to get to the music library.

There were also some positive comments made concerning the library: it is in a convenient location; it is doing well considering how cramped it is; it is generally a good place; the staff tries the best that they can; and there is a nice collection. According to one comment, the music library is "doing very well with the limited space, materials and staff available." Table 7 shows these overall results.

TABLE 7

Distribution of Recommendations
by Rankings and Percentages

	5	4	3	2	1	DK
Hours	62 57.4%	15 13.9%	7 6.5%	9 8.3%	4 3.7%	11 10.2%
Book Acquisitions	28 25.9%	24 22.2%	28 25.9%	3 2.8%	2 1.9%	23 21.3%
Periodical Acquisitions	19 17.4%	19 17.4%	38 34.9%	6 5.5%	3 2.8%	24 22.0%
Staff	31 28.4%	20 18.3%	26 23.9%	7 6.4%	8 7.3%	17 15.6%
AV Machines	22 20.2%	21 19.3%	19 17.4%	7 6.4%	4 3.7%	36 33.0%
AV Acquisitions	19 17.4%	22 20.2%	19 17.4%	9 8.3%	5 4.6%	35 32.1%
Reference Holdings	13 11.9%	18 16.5%	38 34.9%	10 9.2%	1 0.9%	29 26.6%
CATALYST Terminals	21 19.3%	27 24.8%	21 19.3%	11 10.1%	7 6.4%	22 20.2%
Copy Machine	47 43.5%	24 22.2%	19 17.6%	3 2.8%	3 2.8%	12 11.1%
Computer Facilities	26 23.9%	21 19.3%	15 13.8%	7 6.4%	4 3.7%	36 33.0%
Manuscripts & Scores	30 27.8%	21 19.4%	20 18.5%	5 4.6%	1 0.9%	31 28.7%

Results of the Faculty Survey

Ninety questionnaires were handed out to full-time faculty, part-time faculty and graduate assistants. Nineteen forms were returned, a rate of 21.1%.

The first question asked if the faculty member was satisfied with the system for handling books put on reserve. Yes responses were given by thirteen (68.4%); no responses were given by two (10.5%), and no opinion responses were given by four (22.2%).

The second question asked faculty members if they ever had to restrict assignments due to library inadequacy. Eight responses (41.1%) said yes and nine responses (47.3%) said no. The third question asked if faculty book/periodical needs had been adequately met during the last three years. Five answers (26.3%) said yes, ten answers (52.6%) said no, and three answers (15.7%) had no opinion.

The fourth question asked if there were plans for new courses that may require stronger library resources. Ten answers (52.6%) said yes, four answers (22.2%) said no, and five answers (26.3%) had no opinion.

Question number five asked faculty if they had recommended the purchase of books/journals in the past year. Fourteen responses (73.6%) said yes, three responses (15.7) said no, and two responses (10.5%) had no opinion.

Question number six asked the faculty if the distribution of library materials in several locations affected their work.

Eight instructors (41.1%) said yes, eight instructors (41.1%) said no, and two instructors (10.5%) had no opinion.

The next five questions asked the faculty members to rate the collection for its adequacy in supplying materials of teaching and/or research. Those results are shown in Table 8 below:

Table 8

Adequacy of Collection by Use Categories in Frequencies and Percentages

	5	4	3	2	1	DK
Undergraduate Study	4 22.2%	5 26.3%	6 33.3%			4 22.25
Graduate Study		6 33.3%	7 36.8%	5 25.3%	1 10.0%	
Research	1 10.0%	3 33.3%	4 22.2%	7 36.8%	2 15.7%	2 15.7%
Teaching Preparation	1 10.0%	6 33.3%	6 33.3%	1 10.0%		3 33.3%
Current awareness of field	1 10.0%	6 33.3%	6 33.3%	2 15.7%	2 15.7%	

Question number twelve asked faculty if there was any material that they felt the library should have but does not currently own. Seventeen (89.4%) said yes and one (10.0%) said no.

The faculty were then asked to make recommendations. Most of them mentioned obtaining more dubbing machine, copy machines, CATALYSTs, and computers (with music software). They also mentioned lengthening the hours. The majority of them felt strongly that the music library should stay in the music building. There was also mention made of how the library looked. One faculty member stated, "there is always plenty to be done. What can be afforded is being done well."

Analysis of the Hugh A. Glasser Music Library Collection

William E. Grim's biographical essay on the "Music of the Classic Era; a Guide to the Basic Literature" (Grimm 1936) is the first reference used to analyze the collection of the Glasser Library. Grim mentions general works, period studies and individual composers that should be included in an academic music library. Of the eighty-seven titles suggested, the Glasser Library owns fifty-nine (sixty-eight percent).

The first book used to analyze the collection in the library was Kenyon C. Rosenburg's Classical and Operatic Recordings Collection for Libraries. The listings in the book are alphabetical by the composer's last name. The works are then alphabetized by type of composition in the following order: ballet, chamber, choral, concerted, instrumental, operatic,

orchestral, symphonic, and vocal. Each composition is then put in alphabetical order by the title of the piece. Each composition is rated with various symbols to indicate the opinion of the author. The symbols are as follows:

A -required in every library

B -useful in medium and large public and academic libraries

C -recommended only for large public and academic libraries

* -best budget priced stereo version

$ -best regular stereo version

$$ -best and probably most costly version.

The book listed 1003 recommended compositions. The Glasser Music Library contained seventy-six (7%) exact matches with recommended orchestras and publishing companies. The library also had 842 (83.9%) matches with recommended pieces but had different orchestras or publishing companies. The library did not own 161 (16%) recommended compositions.

The second book used for analysis of the Glasser Music Library collection was American Library Association's book A Basic Music Library Collection: Essential Scores and Books. According to the editor, Robert Michael Fling, the purpose of the book is to "serve as a buying guide or selection tool...for collecting music materials in small and medium sized libraries, whether public or academic" (Fling 1983, v). The criteria for inclusion in the book included:

1) availability- the material must be in print at the

time of publication.

2) cost- economy was considered.

3) language- the english language was used for books and periodicals.

4) selection factors- a) were guided by authoritative books in music history and bibliography and b) uniform titles were chosen based on the composer's original title in the original language.

5) arrangement- was by format and subject.

6) index- access was by author/title, composer's uniform title, distinctive title, composer as subject and in a single alphabet.

The overall collection of books, scores, and recordings of the Hugh A. Glasser Music Library is 74%. The analysis of the findings for the Basic Music Library Collection can be found in Table 9.

TABLE 9

Analysis of the Music Library
according to
Basic Music Library Collection (BMLC)

Type of Music	BMLC list	KSU owns	%
Score Anthologies	27	21	77.7
Study Scores: Orchestral Music			
Concertos	75	67	89.3
Symphonies	84	64	76.1
Overtures and other orchestra works	104	83	79.8
TOTAL	263	214	81.7
Study Scores: String Chamber Music			
String Trios	15	12	80.0
String Quartets	48	30	62.5
Piano Quartets	4	2	50.0
String Quintets	8	7	87.5
Piano Quintets	6	5	83.3
sextets, octets	4	3	75.0
Collections	7	0	0.0
TOTAL	92	59	62.6
Study Scores: Chamber Music with Winds			
Trios	14	10	71.4
Quartets	12	5	41.6
Quintets	22	17	77.2
Sextets	14	11	78.5
Septets	7	4	57.1
Octets	7	4	57.1
Collections	2	0	0.0
TOTAL	52	36	54.7
Study Scores: Dramatic and Choral Works			
Opera	36	18	50.0
Choral Music, Sacred and Secular	40	24	48.0
TOTAL	76	42	49.0

TABLE 9 (CONT.)

	BMLC list	KSU owns	%
Performing Editions: Instrumental Solo and Duo			
Strings			
Violin Solo	4	2	50.0
Violin and Piano	16	10	62.5
Viola Solo	4	3	75.0
Viola and Piano	7	4	57.1
Cello Solo	4	3	75.0
Cello and Piano	13	9	69.2
Bass Solo	1	0	0.0
Bass and Piano	3	2	66.6
String Duets	8	4	50.0
TOTAL	60	37	56.1
Woodwinds			
Flute Solo	5	4	80.0
Flute and Piano	13	11	84.6
Oboe Solo	3	1	33.3
Oboe and Piano	6	2	33.3
Clarinet Solo	2	1	50.0
Clarinet and Piano	9	7	77.7
Bassoon Solo	1	0	0.0
Bassoon and Piano	6	4	66.6
Saxophone Solo	1	0	0.0
Saxophone and Piano	7	3	42.8
TOTAL	53	33	46.8
Brass			
Trumpet and Piano	6	5	83.3
Horn and Piano	11	5	45.4
Trombone	1	0	0.0
Trombone and Piano	5	3	60.0
Tuba	1	0	0.0
Tuba and Piano	5	3	60.0
TOTAL	29	16	41.4
Duets with Winds	13	6	46.1

TABLE 9 (CONT.)

	BMLC list	KSU owns	%
Performing Editions: Vocal Music			
Individual Songs and Song Cycles	98	66	67.3
Art Song Collections	9	3	33.3
Aria Collections	1	1	100.0
Sacred Song Collections			
General	4	2	50.0
Christmas Carols	2	0	0.0
Folk Song Collections	7	5	71.4
Popular Song Collections			
National Anthems	1	1	100.0
Collections by Decade	10	1	10.0
Miscellaneous	8	3	37.5
TOTAL	141	82	90.0
Performing Editions: Piano Music			
Solo	120	51	42.5
Collections	15	3	20.0
Piano Four Hands	26	8	30.7
Collections	4	2	50.0
Two Pianos	20	9	45.0
TOTAL	185	73	37.6
Performing Editions: Organ Music			
Organ	70	36	51.4
Collections	11	2	18.1
TOTAL	81	38	34.7
Performing Editions: Concertos			
Strings			
Violin	16	13	81.2
Viola	3	3	100.0
Cello	9	3	33.3
Bass	2	0	0.0
Guitar	1	0	0.0
TOTAL	31	19	58.8

TABLE 9 (CONT.)

	BMLC list	KSU owns	%
Woodwinds			
Flute	6	4	66.6
Oboe	4	1	25.0
Clarinet	4	2	50.0
Bassoon	4	2	50.0
Saxophone	5	3	60.0
TOTAL	23	12	50.3
Brass			
Trumpet	4	2	50.0
Horn	9	2	22.2
Trombone	3	3	100.0
TOTAL	16	7	68.0
Percussion	1	1	100.0
Keyboard			
Harpsichord	2	0	0.0
Organ	5	1	20.0
Piano	38	26	78.7
TOTAL	45	27	32.9
Performing Editions: String Chamber Music			
String Trios	3	3	100.0
Piano Trios	13	12	92.3
Trio Sonatas	34	23	67.6
Piano Quartets	4	4	100.0
String Quintets	7	7	100.0
Piano Quintets	5	5	100.0
Sextets, Octets	3	3	100.0
TOTAL	69	57	94.2
Performing Editions: Chamber Music with Winds			
Trios	10	8	80.0
Trio Sonatas	2	1	50.0
Quartets	8	4	50.0
Quintets	28	21	75.0
Sextets	11	4	36.3
Septets	2	0	0.0
Octets	5	3	60.0
TOTAL	66	41	50.1

TABLE 9 (CONT.)

	BMLC list	KSU owns	%
Vocal Scores: Dramatic Music			
Operas	104	77	74.0
Operettas	12	9	75.0
Musicals	52	11	21.1
TOTAL	168	97	56.7
Vocal Scores: Choral Music	70	46	65.7
Instrumental Methods and Studies			
Strings			
Violin	5	3	60.0
Viola	5	2	40.0
Cello	6	5	83.3
Bass	3	2	66.6
Guitar	6	0	0.0
Banjo	2	1	50.0
Autoharp	2	1	50.0
Dulcimer and Hammered Dulcimer	5	0	0.0
TOTAL	34	14	43.7
Woodwinds			
Flute	7	1	14.2
Oboe	6	0	0.0
Clarinet	5	1	20.0
Alto, Bass & Contrabass Clarinet	7	0	0.0
Bassoon	5	0	0.0
Saxophone	5	0	0.0
Recorder	4	1	25.0
Harmonica	2	0	0.0
TOTAL	41	3	7.4
Brass			
Trumpet/Cornet	5	0	0.0
Horn	6	0	0.0
Trombone/Baritone	7	3	42.8
Bass Trombone & F Attachment	2	2	100.0
Tuba	5	3	60.0
TOTAL	25	8	40.5

TABLE 9 (CONT.)

	BMLC list	KSU owns	%
Percussion			
Timpani	5	2	40.0
Snare	2	1	50.0
Mallet Percussion	4	0	0.0
Multiple Percussion	1	1	100.0
TOTAL	12	4	47.5
Keyboard			
Piano	11	4	36.3
Organ	7	2	28.5
TOTAL	18	6	32.4
Group Instructions			
Strings	2	2	100.0
Brass	1	1	100.0
Woodwinds	1	1	100.0
TOTAL	4	4	100.0
Music Literature: Reference Books			
Dictionaries & Encyclopedias			
General	5	5	100.0
Special Topics	24	21	87.5
Indexes, Bibliographies & Discographies	19	17	89.4
Handbooks & Guides	18	17	94.4
Chronologies	2	2	100.0
Directories	2	1	50.0
TOTAL	70	63	86.8
Music Literature: Periodicals & Yearbooks	61	51	83.6
Music Literature: Biographies			
Individual Biographies	119	98	82.3
Collected Biographies	5	4	80.0
Biographies in Publishers Series	3	2	66.6
TOTAL	127	104	76.3

TABLE 9 (CONT.)

	BMLC list	KSU owns	%
Music Literature: Theory			
Fundamentals	3	3	100.0
Ear Training	2	2	100.0
Notation	4	4	100.0
Harmony	7	7	100.0
Counterpoint	5	5	100.0
Composition	4	4	100.0
Orchestration & Instrumentation	5	5	100.0
Analysis	12	11	91.6
Electronic Music	2	1	50.0
Jazz & Popular Music	3	3	100.0
Philosophy & Physics of Music			
Aesthetics	9	9	100.0
Acoustics	3	3	100.0
Psychology	2	2	100.0
TOTAL	61	59	95.5
Music Literature: History			
Appreciation & Introductory Texts	6	5	83.3
General Histories	11	11	100.0
History (by period)			
Ancient	1	1	100.0
Middle Ages & Renaissance	9	9	100.0
Baroque	4	4	100.0
Classical	4	4	100.0
Romantic	3	3	100.0
20th Century	12	9	75.0
History (by geographical region)			
Africa	2	2	100.0
Americas	4	2	50.0
Asia, Australia & Pacific	3	3	100.0
Ethnomusicology	4	4	100.0
History (by Genre)			
Chamber Music	3	3	100.0
Choral Music	2	2	100.0
Church Music	4	4	100.0
Concerto	2	2	100.0
Keyboard	3	3	100.0

TABLE 9 (CONT.)

	BMLC list	KSU owns	%
Opera	4	4	100.0
Oratorio	1	1	100.0
Sonata	4	4	100.0
Song	4	4	100.0
Symphony	3	2	66.6
History of Instruments			
General	6	5	83.3
Individual Instruments	10	6	60.0
Music Criticism	15	12	80.0
Performance Practices	3	3	100.0
TOTAL			92.2
Music Literature: Music of the United States			
General Works	20	14	63.6
18th Century	7	6	85.7
19th Century	7	6	85.7
20th Century	16	15	93.7
American Indian Music	3	3	100.0
Folk Music	6	4	66.6
Black Music	13	13	100.0
Jazz	16	14	87.5
Popular Currents			
General	1	1	100.0
Country Music	1	1	100.0
Film Music	3	1	33.3
Musical Theatre	4	4	100.0
Popular Song	8	4	50.0
TOTAL	105	84	71.0

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Considering that there has never been a survey of the music library, and after discussion with the music librarian, this researcher decided to cover as many aspects of the music library as possible. The results obtained were informative and will aid the music librarian in future decision making.

The students were asked three specific questions as a way to help judge overall opinions toward the music library. Although student/staff interaction was considered good, there were numerous suggestions to hire music students and provide them with better training so that they could, in turn, better help the patrons of the library. According to the specific question, the overall feelings of the students toward the library were quite high, even though the comments made by those students for corrections indicated otherwise.

Overall, the faculty survey showed that they are satisfied with the handling of books for reserve but they do not feel that all of their book/periodical needs are being met. There are future plans for new courses that may require stronger library resources and communication with the music librarian.

Both the faculty and student surveys indicated their dislike of the library hours. Students want longer evening and weekend hours. Concerns among both the students and faculty were also

indicated in the area of equipment. They feel that there is a need to have more equipment available for use and to have more up-to-date equipment, including computers and music software. A third concern is the condition of the library. Many comments were made concerning the cleanliness of the library and questions were asked as to why the cleaning crew did not come in at least once a week.

The collection of books, scores, and recordings at the Hugh A. Glaucer Music Library is excellant. The library owns 68% of the titles recommended by William E. Grim, 92% of the selections listed by Kenyon C. Rosenburg, and 60% of the books and scores mentioned by the American Library Association. This averages out to a 74% overall collection.

For Further Study

This survey can be expanded in many ways. One way would be to give the survey again at a different time of the year. This would allow freshmen a chance to give their opinion concerning the music library. Another aspect would be to do an in-depth study of one specific area of the library (for example, the facilities or the equipement). A third way would be to analize the music collection again when new editions of the Rosenburg and ALA books are available. It would also be interesting to do the faculty survey again when there is a new set of graduate assistants.

APPENDIX A

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

"USE OF THE KSU MUSIC DEPARTMENT LIBRARY"

USE OF THE KSU MUSIC DEPARTMENT LIBRARY

My name is Linda Potter and I am a graduate student in the School of Library and Information Science. I am conducting a survey to determine who the users of the music department library are, how they use the library, and to what extent the music library meets their needs. The following questionnaire has been designed as a part of my master's degree research paper. Although your participation is really vital to this study, it is, of course, voluntary and you will not be penalized in any way if you do not participate or if you withdraw from participation. The responses to the questionnaire are anonymous, and there are no risks involved on the part of the respondent. There will be no attempt to identify individual respondents as this information is not important to the study. If you have any further questions, you may contact me at 672-7334, Mr. Jack Scott, Music Librarian, at 672-2004, or my research paper adviser, Dr. Lois Buttlar, at 672-2782. The project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have questions about KSU's rules for research, please call Dr. Eugene Wenninger at 672-2070.

1. Please indicate your status:

__ faculty __ graduate student __ undergraduate student

2. Indicate approximately how often you use the music library:

__ 0 hrs/week __ 1-5 hrs/week __ 6-10 hrs/week

__ more than 10 hrs/week

3. Indicate the reasons that you come to the library (check all that apply).

__ review new journals
__ find specific information
__ check out materials
__ use reference materials
__ use AV materials
__ use computer lab
__ look at new books
__ consult the librarian
__ use CATALYST
__ use own books & materials
__ use reserve materials
__ _____

BUILDING AND FACILITIES

4. What kind of work space do you prefer most of the time:

_ individual carrel _ enclosed individual carrel

_ work table _ table for 2-4 people

_ table for 4+ people _ study room (if available)

Rate each statement about the facilities on a scale of five to one. Five is excellent; one is poor; DK is don't know.

5. study space	5 4 3 2 1 DK	6. seating	5 4 3 2 1 DK
7. photocopying	5 4 3 2 1 DK	8. carrels	5 4 3 2 1 DK
9. recording devices	5 4 3 2 1 DK	10. location	5 4 3 2 1 DK
11. computer lab	5 4 3 2 1 DK	12.typing facilities	5 4 3 2 1 DK
13. CATALYST	5 4 3 2 1 DK	14. video player	5 4 3 2 1 DK
15. cassette player	5 4 3 2 1 DK	16. record player	5 4 3 2 1 DK

Rate the listed elements of the environment at the music library. Five is excellent; one is poor; DK is don't know.

17. lighting	5 4 3 2 1 DK	18. heating	5 4 3 2 1 DK
19. ventilation	5 4 3 2 1 DK	20. temperature	5 4 3 2 1 DK
21. signs	5 4 3 2 1 DK	22. quietness	5 4 3 2 1 DK
23. organization	5 4 3 2 1 DK	24. security	5 4 3 2 1 DK
25. maintenance	5 4 3 2 1 DK	26. comfort	5 4 3 2 1 DK
27. cleanliness	5 4 3 2 1 DK		

SERVICES AND STAFF

Please rate the CATALYST system.
Five is excellent; one is poor; DK is don't know.

28. availability	5 4 3 2 1 DK	29. location	5 4 3 2 1 DK
30. functioning	5 4 3 2 1 DK	31. understanding	5 4 3 2 1 DK

Rate the following pieces of equipment with respect to availability and condition. Five is excellent; one is poor; DK is don't know.

32. copy machine	5 4 3 2 1 DK	33. record players	5 4 3 2 1 DK
34. cassette player	5 4 3 2 1 DK	35. CD player	5 4 3 2 1 DK
36. taping machine	5 4 3 2 1 DK	37. dubbing machine	5 4 3 2 1 DK
38. computer lab	5 4 3 2 1 DK		

Rate the quality of library assistance.
Five is excellent; one is poor; DK is don't know.

39. location of a particular item 5 4 3 2 1 DK

40. showing how to use equipment 5 4 3 2 1 DK

41. getting help when needed 5 4 3 2 1 DK

42. cooperativeness of the staff 5 4 3 2 1 DK

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

How would you rate the size of the collection in each of the following subject areas? Five is excellent; one is poor; DK is don't know.

43. music theory 5 4 3 2 1 DK
44. reference books 5 4 3 2 1 DK
45. music manuscripts 5 4 3 2 1 DK
46. vocal music 5 4 3 2 1 DK
47. instrumental music 5 4 3 2 1 DK
48. music literature 5 4 3 2 1 DK
49. music history 5 4 3 2 1
50. conducting 5 4 3 2 1 DK
51. music instruction 5 4 3 2 1 DK

Rate the quality of each collection:
Five is excellent; one is poor; DK is don't know.

52. books 5 4 3 2 1 DK
53. periodicals 5 4 3 2 1 DK
54. reference books 5 4 3 2 1 DK
55. reserve books 5 4 3 2 1 DK
56. recorded material 5 4 3 2 1 DK

Rate the availability of each collection:

57. books 5 4 3 2 1 DK
58. periodicals 5 4 3 2 1 DK
59. reference books 5 4 3 2 1 DK
60. reserve books 5 4 3 2 1 DK
61. recorded material 5 4 3 2 1 DK
(tapes and cassettes)

OVERALL FEELINGS

Rate each of the following statements about your overall feelings:
Five is excellent; one is poor; DK is don't know.

62. How would you rate the music library overall? 5 4 3 2 1 DK

63. How would you rate the quality of interaction between the library staff and the students? 5 4 3 2 1 DK

64. What are your feelings about the library hours? 5 4 3 2 1 DK

Has the following ever happened to you?

65. The material needed is not on the shelf. yes no

66. Time to locate material is excessive. yes no

67. Material was missing from the collection. yes no

68. Rec'd overdue notice for returned material. yes no

69. If you can't find a specific item in the music library, what do you do? Check all the apply.

__ check the re-shelving area
__ ask library staff to look
__ talk to the professor
__ use OCLC
__ use Internet system
__ apply for ILL
__ go to another library
__ give up and leave
__ see if it is checked out and put a hold on it
__ browse in the stacks for something else
__ use what you have and hope it is alright

RECOMMENDATIONS

Mark your feelings concerning an increase of the following:
Five is high priority; one is low priority; DK is don't know.

70. hours 5 4 3 2 1 DK

71. book acquisitions 5 4 3 2 1 DK

72. periodical acquisitions 5 4 3 2 1 DK

73. staff 5 4 3 2 1 DK

74. AV machines 5 4 3 2 1 DK

75. AV acquisitions 5 4 3 2 1 DK

76. reference holdings 5 4 3 2 1 DK

77. CATALYST terminals 5 4 3 2 1 DK

78. copy machines 5 4 3 2 1 DK

79. computer facilities 5 4 3 2 1 DK

80. manuscripts and scores 5 4 3 2 1 DK

81. If you could change, add, or improve any aspect of the music library, what would you do?

APPENDIX B

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

USE OF THE KSU MUSIC DEPARTMENT LIBRARY

My name is Linda Potter and I am a graduate student in the School of Library and Information Science. I am conducting a survey to determine who the users of the music department library are, how they use the library, and to what extent the music library meets their needs. The following questionaire has been designed as a part of my master's degree research paper. Although your participation is really vital tothis study, it is, of course, voluntary andyou will not be penalized in any way if you do not participate or if you withdraw from participation. The responses to the questionnaire are anonymous, and there are no risks involved on the part of the respondent. There willbe no attempt to identify individual respondents as this information is not important to the study. If you have any further questions, you may contact me at 672-7334, Mr. Jack Scott, Muasic Librarian, at 672-2004, or my research paper aadvisor, Dr. Lois Buttlar, at 672-2782. The project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have questions about KSU's rules for research, please call Dr. Eugene Wenninger at 672- 2070.

Please turn over to begin the survey.

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Are you satisfied with the system for handling books put on reserve for assigned readings?

yes no no opinion

2. Have you ever had to restrict assignments due to library inadequacy?

yes no no opinion

3. Have your book/periodical needs been adequately met during the last three years?

yes no no opinion

4. Are there plans for new courses that may require stronger library resources?

yes no no opinion

5. Have you recommended the purchase of books/journals in the past year?

yes no no opinion

6. Does the distribution of library materials in several locations affect your work?

yes no no opinion

Rate the collection for its adequacy in supplying materials for teaching and/or collection research in each of the following areas:

*Five is excellent; one is poor; DK is don't know.

7. undergraduate study 5 4 3 2 1 DK

8. graduate study 5 4 3 2 1 DK

9. research 5 4 3 2 1 DK

10. teaching preparation 5 4 3 2 1 DK

11. current awareness of the musical field 5 4 3 2 1 DK

12. Is there any material, equipment or technology that you think the library should have but does not currently own?

yes no no opinion

13. Feel free to make recommendations on the back.

REFERENCES CITED

Basart, Ann Phillips. 1986. Review of Annual survey of music libraries, edited by Celia Prescott, In Notes 43 (December) : 304-6.

Bayne, Pauline, director, Music Library Association Subcommittee on Basic Music Collection. 1983. A Basic music library: Essential scores and books. Robert Michael Fling, editor. Chicago : American Library Association.

Engelbrecht, Pamela Noyes. 1988. User surveys SPEC kit 146. Systems and Procedures Exchange Center. Washington, D.C. : Association of Research Libraries.

Grim, William E. 1986. Music of the classic era; A guide to the basic literature. Choice 24 (October) : 263-4+.

Kuhlman, A.F., E.W. Erickson and A. Robert Rogers. 1968. Report of a survey of the libraries of Murray State University. Murray, Kentucky : Murray State University.

Lupone, George. 1986. Cleveland State University libraries automation planning report. Cleveland : Cleveland State University Library.

Lyons, William and Linda Phillips. 1987. Library summary, University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Knoxville, Ky. : Tennessee University Libraries.

Mortland, Linda. 1984. The music library: A special library in an academic setting. In Frestschrift in honor of Dr. Arnulfo D. Trejo, edited by Christopher F. Grippo and others. Tucson : University of Arizona Graduate Library School.

Rosenberg, Kenyon C. 1987. A Basic classical and operatic recordings collection for libraries. Metuchen, NJ : Scarecrow Press.

Schloman, Barbara, Roy S. Lilly and Wendy Hu. 1989. Targeting liaison activities: Use of a faculty survey in an academic research library. RQ (Summer) 496-505.

Thompson, Annie F. 1986. Music cataloging in academic libraries and the case for physical decentralization: A survey. Journal of Academic Librarianship 12 (May) 79-83.

University of Michigan. Survey Research Center. 1961. Faculty appraisal of a university library: A report. Ann Arbor : University of Michigan Library.

Valparaiso University. 1980. Small library planning program: Report of the self study. Indianapolis, Ind. : Lilly Endowment, Inc.

Watanabe, Ruth. 1981. American music libraries and music Librarianship: An overview in the Eighties. Notes 38 (December) 239-56.